| _                                      | JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CSBN 44332)<br>United States Attorney   |   |
|--|--|---|
| 2                                      | BRIAN J. STRETCH (CSBN 163973)<br>Chief, Criminal Division   |   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10       |  | TATES DISTRICT COURT I DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |
| 12                                     | Plaintiff,   | )<br>CR No.: CR 07-00788-JF   |
| 13                                     | v.   | )<br>)  |
| 14                                     | MATTHEW SANDOMIR,  | ORDER FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO ENTER FINAL ORDER OF   |
| 15                                     |  | ) RESTITUTION<br>)  |
| 16                                     | Defendant.   | )<br>}  |
| 17                                     | The United States, through its counsel Jeffrey Nedrow, and defendant Matthew   |   |
| 10                                     |  |   |
| TQ                                     | Sandomir, through his counsel Michael Oren   | stein, hereby agree and stipulate to an extension of  |
| 19                                     | ,  | stein, hereby agree and stipulate to an extension of<br>n in this case from February 26, 2009 to May 26,  |
| 19<br>20                               | ,  | , , ,   |
| 18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | time to determine the final order of restitution   | n in this case from February 26, 2009 to May 26,  |
| 19<br>20<br>21<br>22                   | time to determine the final order of restitution 2009.  The parties agree that the following results agree that the following result | n in this case from February 26, 2009 to May 26,  |
| 19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23             | time to determine the final order of restitution 2009.  The parties agree that the following results (1) The parties have agreed that the results (2009).  | n in this case from February 26, 2009 to May 26, easons exist for this continuance:   |
| 19<br>20<br>21                         | time to determine the final order of restitution 2009.  The parties agree that the following results (1) The parties have agreed that the results However, the process of identifying individual restitution to each additional victim, has prove  | n in this case from February 26, 2009 to May 26, easons exist for this continuance: estitution amount shall not exceed \$30,000. all victims, and determining the proper allocation of the more complicated and time-consuming than           |
| 19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24       | time to determine the final order of restitution 2009.  The parties agree that the following results (1) The parties have agreed that the results However, the process of identifying individual restitution to each additional victim, has prove expected in light of the volume of victims and   | easons exist for this continuance: estitution amount shall not exceed \$30,000. al victims, and determining the proper allocation of the more complicated and time-consuming than determined the nature of the paperwork seized from National |
| 19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24<br>25 | time to determine the final order of restitution 2009.  The parties agree that the following results (1) The parties have agreed that the results However, the process of identifying individual restitution to each additional victim, has prove expected in light of the volume of victims and   | n in this case from February 26, 2009 to May 26, easons exist for this continuance: estitution amount shall not exceed \$30,000. all victims, and determining the proper allocation of the more complicated and time-consuming than           |

| 1  | accurate restitution estimate possible. Accordingly, a 90-day extension of time is requested to |  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | complete the research necessary to propose a final order of restitution to the Court. The       |  |
| 3  | probation officer has been notified of this proposed continuance.                               |  |
| 4  | Respectfully submitted,   |  |
| 5  | Respectivity submitted,   |  |
| 6  | , 2009 /s/  |  |
| 7  | , 2009 /s/<br>MICHAEL ORENSTEIN<br>Counsel for Matthew Sandomir                                 |  |
| 8  | Counsel for iviatine w Sandonni   |  |
| 9  | , 2009 /s/  |  |
| 10 | JEFFREY D. NEDROW Assistant United States Attorney  |  |
| 11 | Assistant Office States Attorney  |  |
| 12 |   |  |
| 13 |   |  |
| 14 |   |  |
| 15 |   |  |
| 16 |   |  |
| 17 |   |  |
| 18 |   |  |
| 19 |   |  |
| 20 |   |  |
| 21 |   |  |
| 22 |   |  |
| 23 |   |  |
| 24 |   |  |
| 25 |   |  |
| 26 |   |  |
| 27 |   |  |
| 28 | STIPULATION RE:   |  |
|    | EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FINAL ORDER OF RESTITUTION CR 07-00788-JF 2                               |  |

## UNITED STATES V. MATTHEW SANDOMIR

## **ORDER**

Based on the stipulation of the parties and the facts set forth in the stipulation between the parties, and good cause appearing,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the deadline for determining the final order of restitution in this case is extended from February 26, 2009 to May 26, 2009.

' |

**DATED:** 2/26/09

CR 07-00788-JF

JEREMY FOGEL United States District Judge

STIPULATION RE: EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FINAL ORDER OF RESTITUTION CR 07-00788-JF